IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 6.11.2007

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.D.DINAKARAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.REGUPATHI

H.C.P.No.1086 of 2007

N.Suresh .. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Government of Tamilnadu
rep. by its Secretary
Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.

2. The District Collector
and District Magistrate
Villupuram Collector Office
Villupuram.

3. The Superintendent of Central Prison
Cuddalore. .. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue Habeas Corpus as stated therein.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Vijendran

For Respondents : Mr.N.R.Elango
Addl. Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by P.D.DINAKARAN,J.)

The second respondent herein clamped an order of detention as against Irudayaraj, son of Govindasamy, friend of the petitioner, as the said authority arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the said detenu is a Goonda and he has to be detained under Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Officers, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982).

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2.1. The order of detention dated 15.7.2007 came to be passed by the second respondent on the basis of the ground case, complaint of which was given by one Lakshmi. According to the complainant, on 15.6.2007 at about 6.00 am, when she was cleaning the front portion of the house, three persons entered her house and started demanding cash, documents and jewels by showing knife and criminally intimated her. They tied down her hands and legs, fisted and punched all over her face. The younger son of complainant, who was sleeping in the upstairs, came down and seeing the three intruders armed with weapons, started shouting for help. As people started gathering outside the house, the three persons rushed towards the backside of the house, threatened the public and escaped from the scene. They also threw a country bomb on the crowd. A case was registered in Kadamangalam Police Station in Crime No.180 of 2007 under Sections 397 and 511 of IPC read with Section 3(1) of Explosive Substance Act, 1908. After investigation, the detenu was arrested.

2.2. Apart from the above, the detaining authority also took note of one adverse case pending against the detenu, viz., Crime No.232 of 2006 on the file of the Orleanpet Police Station for the offence punishable under Sections 364-A, 365 read with 34 IPC.

2.3. The detaining authority, having satisfied that the detenu is indulging in activities which are prejudicial to maintenance of public order, passed the impugned order.

3. Challenging the said detention, the friend of the detenu has come forward with the present Habeas Corpus Petition seeking a writ of habeas corpus to call for the records relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent in C2/30555/2007, dated 15.7.2007, to quash the same and consequently to produce the detenu, now detained at the Central Prison, Cuddalore, before this Court and to set him at liberty.

4. Heard Mr.P.Vijendran, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.N.R.Elango, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents.

5. The only contention advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that there is considerable delay in considering the representation and the same has rendered the detention illegal.

6.1. Before delving into the issue relating to the delay as contended above, it would be apt to refer the law on the point.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

6.2. Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India suggests that the obligation of the government is to offer the detenu an opportunity of making a representation against the order, before it is confirmed according to the procedure laid down under the relevant provisions of law, vide K.M. Abdulla Kunhi v. Union of India, (1991) 1 SCC 476 .

6.3. The right to representation under Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India includes right to expeditious disposal by the State Government. Expedition is the rule and delay defeats mandate of Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, vide Ram Sukrya Mhatre v. R.D. Tyagi, 1992 Supp (3) SCC 65.

6.4. Any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the detention illegal, vide Tara Chand v. State of Rajasthan, (1980) 2 SCC 321 and Raghavendra Singh v. Supdt., Distt. Jail, (1986) 1 SCC 650.

6.5. It is a constitutional obligation of the Government to consider the representation forwarded by the detenu without any delay. Though no period is prescribed by Article 22 of the Constitution for the decision to be taken on the representation, the words "as soon as may be" in clause (5) of Article 22 convey the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest. But that does not mean that the authority is pre-empted from explaining any delay which would have occasioned in the disposal of the representation. The court can certainly consider whether the delay was occasioned due to permissible reasons or unavoidable causes. If delay was caused on account of any indifference or lapse in considering the representation, such delay will adversely affect further detention of the prisoner. In other words, it is for the authority concerned to explain the delay, if any, in disposing of the representation. It is not enough to say that the delay was very short. Even longer delay can as well be explained. So the test is not the duration or range of delay, but how it is explained by the authority concerned. Even the reason that the Minister was on tour and hence there was a delay of five days in disposing of the representation was rejected by the Apex Court holding that when the liberty of a citizen guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India is involved, the absence of the Minister at head quarters is not sufficient to justify the delay, since the file could be reached the Minister with utmost promptitude in cases involving the vitally important fundamental right of a citizen, vide Rajammal v. State of T.N., (1999) 1 SCC 417.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

7. In the instant case, the impugned order of detention came to be passed on 15.7.2007. A representation was made to the Government on 27.7.2007 and the same was received by it 30.7.2007. Remarks were called for from the detaining authority on 31.7.2007. After obtaining the remarks of the Sponsoring Authority, the detaining authority sent a report to the Government on 5.8.2007 and the same was received by the Government on 8.8.2007. The Under Secretary, the Additional Secretary dealt with the file on 10.8.2007. The Hon'ble Minister for P.W.D. and Law considered the file on 13.8.2007. But, the rejection letter was prepared only on 20.8.2007, viz., after seven days. Even though 15.8.2007, 18.8.2007 and 19.8.2007 happen to be public holidays, still a delay of 4 days exists. This delay was highlighted by the learned counsel for the petitioner. There is no convincing reply on behalf of the State for the said delay. We find some force as well as substance in this contention. We fail to understand as to why the matter was delayed for four days (excluding public holidays). There is absolutely no explanation for this delay.

8. At this juncture, a reference to the decision of the Apex Court in Kundanbhai Dulabhai Sheikh v District Magistrate, Ahmedabad, (1996) 3 SCC 194 is apposite:

> "In spite of law laid down above by this Court repeatedly over the past three decades, the Executive, namely, the State Government and its officers continue to behave in their old, lethargic fashion and like all other files rusting in the Secretariat for various reasons including red-tapism, the representation made by a person deprived of his liberty, continue to be dealt with in the same fashion. The Government and its officers will not give up their habit of maintaining a consistent attitude of lethargy. So also, this Court will not hesitate in quashing the order of detention to restore the 'liberty and freedom' to the person whose detention is allowed to become bad by the Government itself on account of his representation not being disposed of at the earliest."

9. That apart, it is a settled law that there should not be supine indifference, slackness or callous attitude in considering the representation. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal, vide K.M. Abdulla Kunhi v. Union of India, (1991) 1 SCC 476 .

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

The delay of four days which stands unexplained would fatalise the detention attracting Article 22 of the Constitution of India and therefore, the petition must succeed and the same is ordered as prayed for. The detention order dated 15.7.2007 is set aside. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless his custody is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Asst. Registrar.

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar.

sasi/sra

To:

1. The Secretary to Government
State of Tamilnadu
Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.

2. The District Collector
and District Magistrate
Villupuram Collector Office
Villupuram.

3. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and order)
Fort. St. George,
Chennai-9.

4. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.

5. The Superintendent
Central Prison,
Cuddalore.

WEB COPY

H.C.P.No.1086 of 2007

BS (CO)
kk 16/11

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/